

PATENT APPLICATION FEE DETERMINATION RECORD
Effective October 1, 2003

Application or Docket Number

10813072

CLAIMS AS FILED - PART I

(Column 1) (Column 2)

TOTAL CLAIMS	15	
FOR	NUMBER FILED	NUMBER EXTRA
TOTAL CHARGEABLE CLAIMS	15 minus 20 =	0
INDEPENDENT CLAIMS	minus 3 =	0
MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM PRESENT		<input type="checkbox"/>

If the difference in column 1 is less than zero, enter "0" in column 2

Amend filed 9/6/05

CLAIMS AS AMENDED - PART II

(Column 1) (Column 2) (Column 3)

AMENDMENT A	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT		HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA
	Total	31	Minus	20 = 11
Independent	3	Minus	3	=
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM				<input type="checkbox"/>

SMALL ENTITY
TYPE OTHER THAN
OR SMALL ENTITY

RATE	Fee	RATE	Fee
BASIC FEE	385.00	OR BASIC FEE	770.00
XS 9=		OR XS18=	
X43=		OR X86=	
+145=		OR +290=	
TOTAL	385	OR TOTAL	

OTHER THAN
SMALL ENTITY OR SMALL ENTITY

RATE	ADDI- TIONAL FEE	RATE	ADDI- TIONAL FEE
25 X\$ 9=	275.00	OR XS18=	
X43=	/	OR X86=	
+145=	/	OR +290=	
TOTAL ADDIT. FEE	275	OR TOTAL ADDIT. FEE	

AMENDMENT B	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT		HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA
Total	*	Minus	**	=
Independent	*	Minus	***	=
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM				<input type="checkbox"/>

RATE	ADDI- TIONAL FEE	RATE	ADDI- TIONAL FEE
X\$ 9=		OR XS18=	
X43=		OR X86=	
+145=		OR +290=	
TOTAL ADDIT. FEE		OR TOTAL ADDIT. FEE	

AMENDMENT C	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT		HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA
	Total	Minus	**	=
Independent	*	Minus	***	=
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM				<input type="checkbox"/>

RATE	ADDI- TIONAL FEE	RATE	ADDI- TIONAL FEE
X\$ 9=		OR XS18=	
X43=		OR X86=	
+145=		OR +290=	
TOTAL ADDIT. FEE		OR TOTAL ADDIT. FEE	

- If the entry in column 1 is less than the entry in column 2, write "0" in column 3.
- If the "Highest Number Previously Paid For" IN THIS SPACE is less than 20, enter "20."
- If the "Highest Number Previously Paid For" IN THIS SPACE is less than 3, enter "3."
- The "Highest Number Previously Paid For" (Total or Independent) is the highest number found in the appropriate box in column 1.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



Agent File No.: 16482-1us GH/ik

11425 = \$275.00

Applicant: SERGE LAMOUREUX
Serial No.: 10/813,072
Filed: March 31, 2004
Title: FLOATING DRY DOCK FOR
LIGHT WATERCRAFTS
Examiner: Ajay Vasudeva
Group Art Unit: 3617 Confirmation No. 4651

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
U.S.A.

Sir:

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

In response to the Office Action dated June 6, 2005, please amend the above-identified application as follows.

Amendments to the Specification begin on page 2 of this Paper.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which begins on page 5 of this Paper.

Amendments to the Abstract begin on page 13 of this Paper.

Amendments to the Drawings begin on page 14 of this Paper and include replacement sheets wherein Formal Drawings are being provided. No modifications have been made to the original drawings.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 15 of this Paper.

An Appendix including Formal Drawings is attached following page 16 of this Paper.

Commissioner for Patents

that the sloped forward entryway has a forward projecting edge in a front wall thereof. The claim now further recites that there is a coupling cavity in a lower section of a rear wall thereof. None of the references cited by the Examiner show cavities in opposed walls thereof whereby two support platforms can be nested together end-to-end. First, it is pointed out that the support structure of Rueckert is a rigid structure which would sink under the waterline when a small watercraft is projected thereon. Also, the sloped forward entryway does not project in the front wall thereof. Still further, there is no coupling cavity in a lower section of a rear wall thereof to receive the lower forward projecting edge therein. This structure is clearly not disclosed in either of the two references cited by the Examiner nor would it be obvious to modify the Rueckert platform to do this. In fact, the trough-like upper surface of the Rueckert platform does not extend across the top surface of the platform as now recited in claim 28. If these platforms were nested end-to-end there would be a cavity between the two trough-like upper surfaces because that surface that not extend across the top wall, as noted above.

In view of the above arguments and remarks, this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance and early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
SERGE LAMOUREUX ET AL
By:



September 2, 2005

(Date)

Guy J. Houle (Reg. No. 24,971)
Agent of Record
OGILVY RENAULT LLP
1981 McGill College Avenue, Suite 1600
Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 2Y3
Tel.: (514)847-4321

Enc.

P.S.: The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the excess claims fee in the amount of ~~\$525.00~~, together with any deficiency, to Account No. 19-5113.

B 275.00

United States Patent and Trademark Office
- Sales Receipt -

09/15/2005 MBYARS 00000001 195113 10813072

01 FC:2202 275.00 DA